

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 12-14. These sheets of drawings replace the original sheets of drawings including Figs. 12-14. Figs. 12-14 have been labeled CONVENTIONAL ART.

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 6, 2006, claims 1, 3 and 8 have been amended, and claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

DRAWINGS

The Examiner has indicated that Figs. 12-14 should be labeled PRIOR ART. By this response, replacement sheets of drawings for Figs. 12-14 have been submitted with the figures labeled CONVENTIONAL ART.

OBJECTION TO DISCLOSURE

I. The disclosure has been objected to for not having proper spacing between certain words. The Examiner provides examples of this by reference to "colorelement" on page 2, line 10 and "5e has" on page 42, line 13.

The objection is respectfully traversed.

The present application clearly has been prepared with each of the lines having proportional spacing. A review of both examples cited by the Examiner evinces that they do in fact have *sufficient* proportional spacing to enable a reader to identify that "color element" and "5e has" are the intended individual words. However, to expedite prosecution, the portions of the specification indicated by the Examiner have been amended to increase the distance between the individual words. Consequently, withdrawal of this objection to the disclosure is respectfully solicited.

II. The disclosure has been objected to for having the following informalities:

1. On page 9, line 17, "5" should be "4".
2. Display device 10 is mentioned on page 11, line 5, page 12, line 3, page 54, line 10, but is not specified in the drawings. However, a display device 3 is shown in the drawings.

By this response, the specification has been amended to change "5" to "4" on page 9, line 17 and to change "display device 10" to "display device 3" on page 11, line 5, page 12, line 3, page 54, line 10.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

Claim 3 has been objected to for reciting "basic pattern", which the Examiner contends should be "basic portion" to be consistent with the disclosure.

By this response claim 3 has been amended to change "basic pattern" to "basic portion". Consequently, withdrawal of the objection to claim 3 is respectfully solicited.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1 and 6-8 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 of Koyama (USPN 7,006,096) in view of Uehara et al. (USPN 4, 748,443).

As Koyama (USPN 7,006,096) and the present application are assigned to Sharp Kabushiki Kaisha, a terminal disclaimer has been submitted with this response. Consequently, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter since it is directed to a "program".

The rejection is moot as to canceled claim 7.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

I. Claims 1, 3 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama (USPN 7,006,096).

The rejection is moot as to canceled claim 7.

An important feature of the present invention is that a luminance level of the first pixel based on the changed arrangement pattern is determined using a stored table indicating a correspondence between arrangement patterns of sub-pixels and luminance levels of sub-pixels arranged a certain direction. Use of such a stored table is not disclosed or suggested in Koyama.

Anticipation, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, requires that each element/step of a claim be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the luminance level of the first pixel based on the changed arrangement pattern is determined using a stored table indicating a correspondence between arrangement patterns of sub-pixels and luminance levels of sub-pixels arranged in a certain direction, which is one of the same as the predetermined direction and different from the predetermined direction.

Independent claims 6 and 8 are similarly amended.

Thus, amended independent claims 1, 6 and 8, as well as claim 3 depending from amended claim 1, are patentable over Koyama and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

II. Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama as applied to claim 1, in view of Desai (USPN 6,282,328).

Claim 2 depends from amended independent claim 1 and use of the recited stored table is not disclosed or suggested in Desai also. Thus, dependent claim 2 is patentable over Koyama and Desai, considered alone or in combination, and its allowance is respectfully solicited.

III. Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of Hill et al. (USPN 6,243,070).

Claims 4 and 5 depend from amended independent claim 1 and use of the recited stored table is not disclosed or suggested in Hill et al. also. Thus, dependent claims 4 and 5 are patentable over Koyama and Hill et al., considered alone or in combination, and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise Reg. No. 34,523 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Due: December 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant